

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/533,940	Applicant(s) KENYON ET AL.	
	Examiner RACHEL T. YOUNG	Art Unit 3771	

All Participants:

(1) RACHEL T. YOUNG.

(2) Paul Bowen.

Date of Interview: 24 January 2011

Status of Application: In condition for allowance

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 1 pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

136, 198, 203, 237, 243, 254-266, 277, 281, 289 and 295 as well as the drawings, figures 5, 7-9 and 14

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/RACHEL T YOUNG/
Examiner, Art Unit 3771
/Jusine Yu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner proposed an examiners amendment to the above claims to further define that the water tank is removable to the independent claims that were lacking this. Applicant agreed to these changes. Examiner proposed an amendment to claim 264 of further defining the water tank to include a water tank lid and thus claim 265 was moved into claim 264. Also, claim 277 needed to be rejected under statutory double patenting with co-pending application 12/900,008, however applicant agreed to amend language to overcome this rejection. The drawings listed above needed brackets as was agreed upon by the applicant. These amendments now put the application in condition for allowance.